DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 372 672 HE 027 556

AUTHOR Monahan, Thomas C.
TITLE Obstacles and Motivators for Faculty Involvement in Grant Seeking and Grant Writing Activities in New Jersey's State College System.
PUB DATE 5 Mar 92
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association (Hilton Head, SC, March 3-5, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; *Faculty College Relationship; Faculty Workload; Grants; *Grantsmanship; Higher Education; *Incentives; Proposal Writing; Sex Differences; State Colleges; State Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; Women Faculty
IDENTIFIERS *New Jersey State College System

ABSTRACT

This study looked at barriers, incentives, and assistance to faculty involvement in grant-seeking and grant-writing activities on the eight campuses of the New Jersey State College System. The study surveyed a random sample of 260 faculty from the eight campuses. Of these 136 responded. Analysis found that less than 20 percent were actively engaged in sponsored research activities and nearly half reported they rarely or never engaged in grant development activity. Faculty generally desired released time from teaching and advising to concentrate on sponsored research activities. Heavy teaching loads, other scholarly and entrepreneurial interests, committee work, and lack of advance warning were obstacles that prevented them from participating in sponsored research activities. Faculty who did engage in grant related activities more often reaped benefits of released time, extra clerical help, and recognition for their work in college publications. Also these individuals were more likely to seek and receive technical assistance in other areas. Junior faculty reported that they received technical assistance less frequently than their senior colleagues. Data indicated no difference between male and female professors except that females were more likely to stress the importance of technical assistance. A conclusion offers specific recommendations for institutions to foster grantsmanship among faculty. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 372 672

OBSTACLES AND MOTIVATORS FOR FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN GRANT SEEKING AND GRANT WRITING ACTIVITIES IN NEW JERSEY'S STATE COLLEGE SYSTEM

Thomas C. Monahan

Acting Dean of Graduate Studies and Sponsored Research
Glassboro State College
Glassboro, New Jersey

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thomas C. Monahan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Paper Presentation

The Annual Meeting of the
Eastern Educational Research Association

Hilton Head, South Carolina
March 3-5, 1992

HE 027 536

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

As the 1990's progress, most public colleges and universities will continue to face declining state appropriations that support the primary operations of these institutions. In New Jersey, this is especially true despite a whopping $2.8 billion tax increase in 1990--the largest in the State's history. This curtailment of state support for New Jersey's public colleges and universities had a corresponding effect on the Department of Higher Education's grants initiative program. First enacted during former Governor Kean's administration in the 1980's, this program disbursed more than $50 million in state grants for computers in the curriculum, technical and engineering education, humanities, foreign languages, math and science instructional improvement and student retention. With the decline in tax revenues, the grants initiative program was essentially dismantled. Once content to focus their grant seeking activities on the locally-based grants initiatives program, many of the faculties of New Jersey's colleges and universities have now been forced to seek funding in the highly competitive federal and private sectors. Because of the risk and the investment of time associated with grant-seeking in much more difficult arenas, many faculty, especially those in predominantly undergraduate teaching institutions, will forego such activity and retreat to the relative safety of their primary roles as teachers. Plucker (1988) found that many faculty at research and other universities consider teaching, not research, to be of primary importance. Nevertheless, these faculty see publication as a primary source of professional achievement and as the main requirement form promotion, tenure, and higher salaries. However, Stein (1989), in editorializing about the future of the 1990's, suggested that fewer faculty, especially senior professors, will seek grants because of heavy teaching loads, increased committee work, fewer administrative support services and less time. This places a significant burden on the institutions. For not only do they now face declining appropriations and state grant opportunities which otherwise would have provided funds for much needed equipment and curricular reforms, they must also assist faculty in developing new outlets for creative and scholarly pursuits.

In the past few years, several researchers have focused on the characteristics and motivators associated with successful grant-seeking and on the barriers and obstacles which some suggest act as disincentives to faculty involvement in the grant-seeking and grant-writing process. This study began by reviewing the literature for examples of motivators for grant-seeking activities as well as impediments that are said to prevent faculty from engaging in extramural research.

Young (1978) conducted a study to isolate conditions and factors associated with successful federal grants. He found that among the factors which influenced success in obtaining grants were clearly defined institutional plans and objectives, a fully operational grants office with a full-time grants officer, well-conceived and well-prepared proposals, and a strong commitment by the college president. Institutions that generally were not successful in obtaining federal grants cited a lack of knowledge about the availability of grants funding, lack of time, staff and financial support, and a lack of assistance in grant proposal preparation.

Fiedler (1979) found that, among faculty at the University of Washington who engaged

in research activities, assistance in proposal development was the most frequently requested administrative support service. These faculty also requested more and better information on university procedures and regulations and indicated that the support provided from (institutional) overhead was inadequate.

Lischwe (1987) reported that, at one university, in-depth faculty seminars in grant development and individual assistance in grant proposal preparation were successful in removing intimidation from the grants process.

Bergen (1989) identified a variety of factors that seemed to be associated with success in securing federal grants. She found that factors such as direct an sustained commitment of administrative support, dissemination of grant opportunity information, and assistance in proposal development, while not significantly related to direct success, were necessary as seed activities to enhance the research/grants seeking climate.

Meyer (1989) reports that some faculty are motivated to engage in research to fund their need for specialized equipment, while others seek grants to support program development that will improve students' educations. Still other see the return on investment as publications, conferences, interactions with graduate students, or the intrinsic satisfaction of successful research. She suggests that administrative support, individualized rewards (including public recognition and pecuniary incentives) are important factors in encouraging faculty to engage in research activities.

Hellweg and Churchman (1979) found that increased instructional workloads, less diversified faculty resources, lack of administrative encouragement or assistance in grants development, faculty attitudes against grantsmanship and superfluous institutional obstacles deterred many faculty from engaging in the time-consuming and risky grant development activities. The researchers suggest several corrective policies including, among others, institutional workshops and seminars to assist faculty in proposal development.

Perhaps the most comprehensive research done on impediments to faculty involvement in the research process was conducted by Larry Daniels and Irene Gallaher in 1989. Their research identified the following barriers: (1) lack of time, (2) lack of information about funding sources, (3) lack of procedural information, (4) lack of a clearly defined systems of rewards for those who obtain external funding. They further found that faculty were generally unsure of the importance of grants and research in the overall scheme of administrative expectations of faculty. Finally, they identified the need for technical assistance in proposal development, a clearly articulated reward system for those who were engaged in grant-seeking activities, released time to pursue external funding, and administrative support for the grants process as important factors to encourage faculty to pursue grants and research activity.

This research was designed to extend the work of earlier researchers in general, and Daniels and Gallaher, in particular. Specifically, this research sought to identify the extent to which selected factors, identified in previous research as impediments to faculty involvement in

grant-seeking and grant-writing activities, actually did so among faculty in the eight campus-based state colleges in New Jersey. Moreover, this research sought to determine what rewards were offered to New Jersey state college faculty for engaging in grant-seeking and grant-writing activities and how important they considered such rewards. Finally, this research sought to determine the extent to which different types of technical assistance were provided and how important each was.

Study Objectives

This research had four objectives, as follows:

1. to determine what types of rewards, if any, that were provided by New Jersey state colleges to their faculties for engaging in grant seeking or grant writing activities, and the perceived importance of such rewards;

2. to determine the extent to which selected factors serve as obstacles or impediments to New Jersey state college faculty to their grant seeking or grant writing activities;

3. to determine the types of technical assistance offered by New Jersey state colleges to their faculties to motivate them to engage in grant seeking or grant writing activities and to assess the frequency and perceived importance of such types of technical assistance;

4. to determine if any systematic differences exist among New Jersey state college faculty members regarding motivating or inhibiting factors or for the types of technical assistance provided for their grant seeking or grant writing activities.

Study Methodology

A sample of 260 faculty in the eight campus-based state colleges in New Jersey. These included Ramapo College, Kean College, Jersey City State College, William Paterson College, Montclair State College, Trenton State College, Glassboro State College, and Richard Stockton State College. The sample, identified through a systematic random selection of faculty names from the most current undergraduate catalogs, was designed to have a confidence level of 90 percent with an acceptable margin of error of $\pm$ .05.

A draft survey instrument was developed based upon the study objectives as well as the motivators and obstacles that were suggested in the literature. The instrument was field tested among nine faculty at one state college and was refined based on the criticisms received from these faculty. The instrument was mailed to each subject in the sample. Included with the survey instrument was a pre-addressed postage paid postal card which carried the name of the subject. The instructions were to complete the survey instrument and return it a postage paid return envelope. The pre-addressed postal card was to be mailed at the same time, but under separate cover. In this way, some control could be maintained in the survey. Approximately 10 days after the surveys were due to be returned, a second survey was sent to all subjects from whom

completed instruments had not been received. Usable surveys were eventually received from 136 faculty (52 percent). Check were performed which determined that returns were fairly distributed across all eight institutions, with no college significantly over- or under-represented. Telephone calls were made to eighteen non-respondents (15 percent) to determine if there was any systematic non-response bias present. Successful contacts were made with thirteen subjects who had not returned completed instruments. Based upon their responses, which included such things as "not remembering having received it", "couldn't respond because of the press of time associated with grading final exams", and "surveys are generally not worth responding to", it was determined that no systematic non-response bias was present.

Analysis Procedures

Data were analyzed using SPSS PC+. Simple frequency counts were generated for each question in the survey. These frequency counts provided the data necessary to describe the survey results. In addition, a number of significance tests were run to determine whether any systematic differences were observed among the faculty in the sample. The classifying variables used to determine statistically significant differences were (a) those respondents who "very often" or "often" engaged in grant seeking or grant writing activities and those who engaged in grants activity "sometimes", "rarely" or "never"; (b) those respondents who "very often" or "often" received assistance from their college administrations in identifying or locating grants opportunities and those who received such assistance only "sometimes", "rarely" or "never"; (c) gender; (d) academic rank (i.e., senior and junior professors); (e) length of teaching experience, and (f) tenure status. For purposes of this research, statistical significance was established at the $p \leq .05$ level.

Demographics of the Sample

A total of 270 faculty was originally identified for participation in the survey. However, from this number, it was learned that 10 faculty members had either retired, resigned, or were deceased. Of the 260 faculty who remained, usable responses were received from 136 individuals.

Sixty-five percent of the respondents were male, and 35 percent were female. Thirty-eight percent held the rank of professor; '35 percent were associate professor, and the remaining 27 percent were assistant professor. Seventy-one percent had more than 15 years of full-time college or university teaching experience; 10 percent had between 11-15 years of experience; 16 percent had between 6-10 years of experience, and the remaining 4 percent had between 1-5 years of experience. Eighty-nine percent of the respondents were tenured; 11 percent were non-tenured. The majority of respondents identified themselves as humanities professors (23 percent) or education professors (20 percent). The remaining identified themselves as professors of natural sciences (14 percent), mathematics or information sciences (14 percent), social sciences (16 percent), health sciences (6 percent), fine and performing arts (5 percent) and business (2 percent). Eighty percent of the respondents indicated that their colleges had an operating Office of Grants or Sponsored Research; 13 percent indicated that no grants office existed on their campuses, and 7 percent indicated they didn't know.

Findings

When asked to indicate the relative frequency in which they engaged in grant seeking or grant writing activities, only 19 percent of the respondents reported that they did so "very often" or "often". Thirty-four percent reported that they "sometimes" engaged in grants activity, and the remaining 47 percent reported that they "rarely" or "never" engaged in grant seeking or grants writing activities.

The extent to which faculty respondents received assistance from their colleges in identifying or locating sources of outside funding for their research ideas was nearly evenly distributed. Approximately one-third of the sample reported that such assistance was provided "very often" or "often". Another one-third (30 percent) reported that they received such assistance "sometimes", and the remaining one-third (36 percent) reported they received such assistance "rarely" or "never".

Sample respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which selected examples of motivators were provided by their colleges for engaging in grant seeking or grant writing activities. The most frequently reported response was recognition in college publications (61 percent reported "very often" or "often"). Released time to work on successful grants (44 percent reported "very often" or "often") and consideration in tenure and promotion decisions (41 percent reported "very often" or "often") were also reported. Other responses for which sample subjects reported "very often" or "often" were (a) other forms of public recognition (29 percent), extra College funds for travel or equipment (15 percent), extra secretarial help or graduate assistants (11 percent), and return to the academic department of a portion of the indirect costs derived from the grant (4 percent). One other factor, released time to prepare a proposal, was reported by 5 percent of the respondents as having been provided "often" by their colleges. None of the respondents reported that released time fore this reason was provided "very often". More detailed information about the frequency of motivators provided by respondents' institutions is presented in Table 1.

Insert Table 1 Here

When asked to indicate those factors which were important in motivating faculty to engage in grant seeking and grant writing activities, the overwhelming majority (89 percent) reported both released time to work on successful grants and having the opportunity to support promising ideas were either "very important" or "important". Following closely behind in importance were building a professional reputation as a capable researcher (80 percent rated this factor either "very important" or "important"), the satisfaction of obtaining a grant (78 percent rated this factor as "very important" or "important"), consideration in promotion and tenure decisions and extra College funds for travel and equipment (77 percent rated both of these factors "very important" or "important"), extra secretarial help or graduate assistants, released time to prepare a proposal, and having the resources to acquire much-needed equipment with grant funds

(74 percent each), helping to gain recognition for the institution (61 percent), personal financial compensation (56 percent), recognition in College publications (48 percent), other forms of public recognition (47 percent), and a return to the academic department of a portion of the indirect costs derived from the grant (43 percent).

When asked to indicate the most important rewards that their Colleges could offer for faculty who engage in grant seeking or grant writing activities, the respondents clearly indicated their preference for released time from their regularly assigned duties.
More than 78 eight percent of the respondents indicated that they wanted released time to work on proposals and successful grants. In addition to released time, 47 percent reported that they wanted greater recognition for their grant-related activities. Finally, more than a third (34 percent) wanted more weight to be given to the grant-related activities in the tenure and promotion process.

More detailed information concerning both the tangible and intangible factors that appear to motivate faculty to engage in grant seeking and grant writing activity is presented in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 Here

When asked to indicate the extent to which selected obstacles or impediments prevented them for engaging in grant seeking or grant writing activities, the overwhelming majority (89 percent) reported their heavy teaching loads as either "very much" or "much". Other barriers that were identified were heavy student advising load and other scholarly or entrepreneurial interests (47 percent reported these as "very much" or "much"), committee assignments (43 percent), other departmental or college assignments (42 percent), and lack of sufficient advance warning to prepare a competitive proposal (40 percent). Thirty-nine percent of the respondents reported that grant-related activity was too much work and bother. Less than a third of the respondents reported a lack of knowledge about funding sources (32 percent), lack of training in grant seeking or grant writing (31 percent), lack of knowledge of budgeting (28 percent), no colleagues with whom to work (28 percent), cumbersome sponsor regulations (17 percent), and campus proposal review and approval requirements serve to "very much" or "much" prevent faculty from engaging in grant-related activity. (See Table 3)

As a result of these obstacles or impediments, only 22 percent of the respondents reported that they "very often" or "often" were usually able to find the time to write proposals in which they had an interest.

Insert Table 3 Here

When asked to report the frequency with which different types of technical assistance were provided by their Colleges, 34 percent reported that help in how to look for grant opportunities was provided "very often" or "often". Eighty-four percent of the respondents reported that this type of help was either "very important" or "important". Twenty-five percent of the respondents reported that help in getting the necessary administrative approvals for proposals was provided "very often" or "often", and 77 percent felt this type of help was either "very important" or "important". Seventeen percent of the respondents reported that help in dealing with the College's Business Office was provided either "very often" or "often", and 72 percent felt that this type of help was either "very important" or "important". Only 15 percent of the respondents reported that they received help in learning how to write competitive proposals, but 82 percent felt that this type of help was either "very important" or "important". Only 14 percent of the respondents reported that they received help in learni ɜ how to prepare accurate budgets "very often" or "often", but 80 percent felt that this type of help was either "very important" or "important". Finally, only 11 percent of the respondents reported that they received help in learning how to deal with prospective sponsors "very often" or "often", but 77 percent felt that this type of help was either "very important" or "important". More detailed information on technical assistance is presented in Tables 4 and 5.

Insert Tables 4 & 5 Here

Systematic differences were observed among the faculty respondents on certain of the classifying variables. Faculty who reported that they "very often" or "often" engaged in grant seeking or grant writing activities also reported more frequently than faculty who reported that they engaged in grant activity "sometimes", "rarely", or "never" that they received released time to work on successful grants (t=2.66, p=.009), extra clerical help or graduate assistants (t=2.98, p=.004), extra College funds for travel or equipment (t=2.36, p=.02), consideration in the tenure and promotion process (t=2.25, p=.027), and recognition in College publications (t=2.63, p=.01). Similarly, faculty who reported that they "very often" or "often" engaged in grant seeking or grant writing activities also reported that they received more technical assistance than their less active colleagues in how to look for grant opportunities (t=2.52, p=.013), how to obtain campus administrative approvals (t=2.41, p=.018), how to deal with prospective sponsors (t=3.14, p=.002), and how to deal with the College business office (t=3.32, p=.001). Faculty who reported that their campuses had functioning grants or sponsored research offices also reported that they received more technical assistance than their colleagues without such an office in how to look for grants opportunities (t=5.25, p=.0001), how to write competitive proposals (t=4.44, p=.0001), how to prepare accurate and adequate budgets (t=3.63, p=.0001), how to obtain campus administrative approvals (t=4.16, p=.0001), how to deal with prospective sponsors (t=3.57, p=.001), and how to deal with the College business office (t=3.22, p=.002). Finally, full and associate professors were more likely than their junior colleagues to report that they frequently received technical assistance in how to look for grant opportunities (t=2.20, p=.03), how to write

competitive proposals (t=2.66, p=.009), how to prepare accurate and adequate budgets (t=2.45, p=.016), and how to obtain campus administrative approvals (t=3.10, p=.002).

With regard to the importance of such technical assistance, there were striking differences between male and female professors. Female professors were much more likely than their male colleagues to stress the importance of technical assistance in how to look for grant opportunities (t=2.26, p=.025), how to write competitive proposals (t=3.15, p=.002), how to prepare accurate and adequate budgets (t=3.98, p=.0001), how to obtain campus administrative approvals (t=3.29, p=.001), how to deal with prospective sponsors (t=3.79, p=.0001), and how to deal with the College business office (t=3.60, p=.0001).

Finally, significant differences were observed between those who reported that they "very often" or "often" engaged in grant seeking or grant activities and those who were less active regarding perceived obstacles to the grant activities. Active faculty were less likely than their counterparts to perceive as obstacles, such factors as heavy student advising load (t=2.23, p=.027), sponsor rules and regulations (t=2.45, p=.016), lack of training in grant seeking and grant writing (t=3.36, p=.001), lack of knowledge of funding sources (t=2.29, p=.024), and lack of knowledge of budgeting (t=2.81, p=.006).

Discussion

In discussing these findings, the author must admit to some biases that certainly influence the manner in which this research is interpreted. These biases are not, however, capricious; they are founded on seven years of experience as a grants officer in one of the campuses involved in this study. And so, while they may statistically represent all New Jersey state college faculty, it is safe to assume that these biases are characteristic of at least some of them. First, many faculty, despite what they may claim, do not see a need to engage in grant seeking or grant writing. As the survey data suggest, the faculty in New Jersey's state colleges are greying; the majority are tenured, hold either full or associate professorships, and have been teaching (usually at the same institution) for more than 15 years. These faculty have no need to add to their professional resumes; they seek neither promotion, tenure, nor new jobs at other institutions. Furthermore, among this group are those faculty who consciously spurn grants. They see themselves primarily as teachers and not researchers, and they see set-asides for grants (particularly in New Jersey) as money that could better be spent to increase the number of faculty lines available to the state colleges. Consequently, despite the claims that at least some will make about the lack of administrative support for any professional development, the sad truth is that some faculty would not seek grants under any conditions. For them, grants simply represent too much of an investment of time and energy for successes that they neither need nor want.

Second, not all faculty read everything that is sent to them, and, even if they do read their correspondence, many will not remember having seen what they read.

Only a relatively small percentage of faculty are heavily engaged in either grant seeking

or grant writing. This may be due in part to the fact that relatively few faculty claim to receive assistance from their colleges in identifying or locating sources of outside funding for their research ideas.

The types of rewards that New Jersey's state colleges provide their faculties are the types that generally do not require an outlay of hard currency. The survey respondents reported that they receive recognition in College publications, released time to work on successful grants (which, in all probability is grant-financed), and consideration in the promotion and tenure process. Only in limited instances did faculty indicate that they got extra College money for travel, equipment, or secretarial help or that their departments shared in the indirect costs derived from the grant. New Jersey colleges generally do not provide released time to seek grant opportunities or to write proposals. This means that faculty have to absorb this labor intensive and risky venture into their existing schedules. Some faculty are unable or unwilling to do this.

The analysis revealed that there were a number of statistically significant differences between faculty who "very often" and "often" engaged in grant seeking or grant writing and those who did so "sometimes", "rarely", or "never". It further revealed significant differences between senior and junior professors and between female and male professors. Most of these differences, however, were not unusual. Faculty who engage in grant related activities are more likely than those who do not to reap the benefits of released time, extra clerical help, and recognition for their work in College publications. It is similarly not unusual for faculty active in grant to receive greater recognition of their work in the tenure and promotion process. Additionally, faculty who are more active in grants than others are more likely to seek, and therefore receive, technical assistance in a variety of important areas. And, campuses with functioning grants or sponsored research offices are in a far better position to provide various kinds of technical assistance than campuses that do not have such offices. What may be of some importance, however, is the fact that junior faculty report that they receive technical assistance less frequently than their senior colleagues. Younger, less experienced faculty presumably need more help in pursuing their research agendas.Consequently, College administrations should make a conscious effort to provide technical assistance to their faculties, especially junior faculty. It should be kept in mind, however, that many junior faculty, especially non-tenured junior faculty, are still honing their teaching skills and may not yet have begun to focus on their research-oriented professional development.

While there is so significant difference between male and female professors on the extent to which they receive technical assistance, interesting differences were observed on the importance male and female professors place on such assistance. Females were more likely to stress the importance of this help than their male colleagues. This may be because many female professors view research and grants as a way of closing the gap between themselves and their male colleagues in what they perceive as a male dominated career field. Subsequently, gaining the necessary expertise to compete for grants is viewed as extremely important to them.

Statistically significant differences were observed between faculty who "very often" or "often" engaged in grant seeking or grant writing and those who did so only "sometimes", "rarely", or never" on perceived obstacles to grant activities. Again, this is not unusual. Faculty who are less likely to engage in grant related activities are more likely to identify obstacles, real and imagined, that prevent them from doing so. The fact is that many faculty, while they may be trained in research and statistical methods, are generally not adequately trained in the art of grantsmanship. In order to be successful in grant development, one must know which sponsoring agencies offer what kinds of grant opportunities and at what time of the academic year. Furthermore, they must know how to clearly articulate the need for their projects and the objectives they seek to achieve. They must also be shown how to develop budgets that include accurate and reasonable costs for their research and how to negotiate their budgets with the sponsoring agencies. Finally, getting a proposal through the bureaucratic maze can be a frustrating exercise for even the most seasoned grant writer; for a novice, it can be a nightmare. And, nothing will sour a young grantwriter more quickly than the perception that their own administrations are working at cross purposes with them.

In predominantly undergraduate teaching institutions, what faculty want most in order to compete for grants is a reduced teaching load. Faculty recognize that identifying potential sponsors and writing (and re-writing) proposals take time. Proposals that are written speculatively and are submitted to a number of potential sponsors in a shotgun approach are often refused. Similarly, hastily prepared proposals, written in the face of rapidly approaching deadlines, are not likely to be funded. Proposal development takes time, and many faculty insist that, if their administrations are serious about creating a climate that is conducive to grant activity, they must be committed to provide faculty with the released time necessary to develop well conceived and well written proposals for appropriately targeted sponsors.

Summary and Conclusions

In this survey of faculty in the eight campus-based state colleges in New Jersey, it was found that less than 20 percent were actively engaged in sponsored research activities. In fact, nearly half of the faculty respondents reported that they rarely or never engage in grant development activity. Faculty generally desire released time from what they consider to be heavy teaching and advising loads in order to concentrate on sponsored research activities. They further want more recognition for their roles as researchers and greater consideration of their grants activity in the promotion and tenure process. They reported that heavy teaching loads, other scholarly and entrepreneurial interests, committee or other such assignments, and lack of advance warning as obstacles that prevented them from participating in sponsored research activities. Despite the finding that less than one third of the respondents felt that lack of knowledge about funding opportunities, proposal and budget development, and campus administrative approvals serve as obstacles to their sponsored research activities, relatively few faculty report that technical assistance in these areas was frequently provided. Furthermore, senior faculty reported significantly greater provision of technical assistance in these areas, and female professors considered technical assistance in these areas to be of significantly greater importance than their male colleagues.

If college administrations wish to send a message that they do, indeed, value the scholarly activities of their faculties, there are a number of things that can be done. In the paragraphs that follow, nine recommendations are offered to encourage and motivate faculty, especially those at primarily undergraduate teaching institutions, to engage in sponsored research activities.

First, if college campuses do not have an active grants or sponsored research office, one should be created. The relative costs of staffing such a unit, when viewed in terms of faculty productivity and morale (not considering the potentially offsetting revenue attracted to the institution by successful grants) will be well worth the expense.

Second, campus grants offices should not simply be the place where completed applications are processed. Functional grants or sponsored research offices should include, in addition to a grants administrator, grant writing specialists who are willing to roll up their sleeves and help faculty in the difficult task of finding suitable potential sponsors for their (sometimes esoteric) ideas. Such individuals should also be willing to help write (or at least edit and critique) sections of proposals. Faculty respect and value such assistance. When they see that the administration is willing to commit resources for these difficult tasks, they are encouraged and are willing to work harder themselves.

Third, grants administrators should develop a faculty handbook or manual for grants and contracts. Such a document should, at a minimum, contain information about college policies regarding contact with potential sponsors, proposal and budget preparation, and obtaining the necessary administrative approvals for proposals and contracts. The document should further explain the duties and responsibilities of project directors and principal investigators, how grant administration works, and who is authorized to negotiate and sign on behalf of the institution. Where applicable, this document should provide all the necessary policies regarding patents, human and animal subjects protection, ownership rights, facilities, etc. A copy of this handbook or manual should be distributed to all new faculty members as part of their general orientation.

Fourth, grants administrators should be proactive in their technical assistance and training programs. They should be willing to offer a variety of workshops or seminar sessions, as well as the same workshops and seminars, at many different times and locations that are easily accessible for faculty. Moreover, greater attention may have to be paid to interested female and junior faculty. This willingness to accommodate the schedules of faculty members will be viewed by faculty as a commitment by the administration to provide the necessary expertise to help them.

Fifth, every attempt should be made to streamline the campus proposal approval process. A careful analysis is suggested to determine exactly who must sign off on proposals. At least some colleges and universities require approval and signatures by department chairpersons, school deans, personnel officers, budget officers, grants officers, vice presidents, and the president. If one or more of these signatories can be eliminated without sacrificing the integrity of the process, the efficiency with which proposals may be dispatched can be significantly improved.

Sixth, college administrations should make every effort to provide and communicate a

system of tangible rewards for engaging in sponsored research activities. One way is to provide a limited amount of released time to prepare proposals. In New Jersey, annual appropriations from the state legislature have historically contained a line item amount for separately budgeted research. Perhaps an allocation could be set aside for awards to faculty to engage in speculative proposal development. Such an award would carry with it the responsibility to develop and submit at least one proposal for external funding. Another way to provide rewards is to reallocate a significant percentage of the indirect or administrative costs derived from successful grants to the departments in which the project's faculty are members. These funds may be used to support additional travel by faculty grantees for research and conferences. Administrations might also consider using indirect or administrative costs to establish a research fund to pay adjunct faculty to replace those given released time to write proposals.

Consideration should also be given to providing a modest stipend for successful grant awards or published works in appropriately refereed or juried journals. Stipends of perhaps $25 or $50 can be provided by the institution's foundation and, generally, should not cost more than a few thousand dollars per year. Such stipends are a way that administrations can demonstrate, in a small financial way, that they value and appreciate the scholarly activity of their faculty. Consideration should further be given to providing a "research award of the year". This recognition could be a non-cash award made to the faculty member whose scholarly activity is judged by a committee of peers to be the most outstanding in his or her field. Such awards could be made within each school or college of the institution or could be institution-wide.

Seventh, college administrations should be proactive in promoting collegial work, especially with students. Grants administrators should develop surveys to ascertain which faculty have similar interests and should provide the opportunity to bring such individuals together to respond to a request for proposal or to develop a speculative proposal.

Eighth, grants administrators should communicate clearly and frequently that they value grant development and sponsored research as a form of scholarly activity. Whenever a faculty member submits a proposal or receives an award, some public recognition should be made. Letters of acknowledgement (for proposals) and letters of congratulations (for successful awards) should be sent by the president to the affected faculty member. Campus newspapers, alumni bulletins, and boards of trustees minutes should contain notices and recognition of faculty scholarship. Even a personal telephone call by the provost or dean to a successful grantee will go far in creating a climate of mutual respect and appreciation.

Finally, academic departments should consider the addition of a grant development course to their graduate curricula. This could provide the opportunity for potential faculty members to learn how to seek funding opportunities and write competitive grants.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Bergen, Doris, Bitting, Christina, and Kleinert, Dean. Federal Funding of Higher Education Proposals: Relationship of Research/Sponsored programs Office Characteristics to Success Rates. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1989.

Daniel, Larry G. and Gallaher, Irene. Impediments to Faculty Involvement in Grant Related Activities. *Journal of the Society of Research Administrators. 22(2):5-13.*

Fiedler, Judith. Faculty Opinion of University Research Support Services, Report No. 79-13. Washington University, Educational Assessment Center, 1979.

Hellweg, Susan A. and Churchman, David A. Grants Seeking Barriers and Solutions for Community College Faculty. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Antonio, 1979.

Lischwe, Sheila, et al. Encouraging the Research Process: SIUE's Experimental Grants Seminar for Faculty. *Journal of the Society of Research Administrators. 18(3):49-53.*

Meyer, Katrina. Disincentives to Grants: A Return on Investment. *Grants Magazine. 12(3):121-131.*

Plucker, Frank E. Institutional Factors that Motivate Research Activity in Research Universities. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, St. Louis, 1988.

Stein, Eugene L. "As We Enter the 1990's" - Editorial Comment. *Grants Magazine. 12(2):66.*

Young, John E. Conditions and Factors Associated with Successful Federal Funding, Resource Paper No. 15. Washington D.C.: National Council for Resource Development, 1978.

Table 1

Frequency of Provision of Selected Rewards and Other Factors For Engaging in Grant Seeking and Grant Writing Activities

(Percentages)

	Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Released time to prepare a proposal	0	5	11	14	62
Released time to work on a successful grant	12	32	25	9	10
Return to department of a portion of the indirect costs derived from the grant	2	2	16	10	35
Personnel support (e.g., secretarial help or graduate assistants)	5	7	23	20	32
Administrative support (e.g., extra funds for travel or equipment)	3	12	30	23	21
Consideration in tenure or promotion decisions	15	26	20	5	15
Recognition in College or University publications	27	35	20	6	4
Other forms of public recognition	8	21	24	12	14

Note: Percentages may not equal 100 percent because respondents who indicated "Don't Know" or "Does Not Apply" have been omitted.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2
Importance of Factors in Encouraging Faculty to Engage in Grant Seeking and Grant Writing Activities

(Percentages)

	Very Important	Moderately Important	Marginally Important	Not Important
Released time to prepare proposal	40	34	10	8
Released time to work on grants awarded	75	14	4	3
Return to department of a portion of the indirect costs derived from grant	16	27	25	13
Personnel support (secretarial help or graduate assistants)	38	36	14	5
Administrative support (extra College funds for travel or equipment)	38	39	16	4
Consideration in tenure or promotion decisions	52	25	10	6
Recognition in College publications	28	20	29	18
Other forms of public recognition	21	26	27	16
Personal financial compensation	24	32	21	15
Satisfaction of obtaining grant	47	31	12	6
Having opportunity to support promising ideas or research	69	20	7	2
Having resources to acquire much-needed equipment	47	27	13	8
Gaining recognition for my institution	21	40	25	12
Building my professional reputation as a capable researcher	48	32	11	7

Note: Percentages may not equal 100 percent because respondents who indicated "Don't Know" or "Does Not Apply" have been omitted.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3

Extent to Which Selected Factors Serve as Obstacles to Grant Seeking or Grant Writing

(Percentages)

	Very Much	Much	Somewhat	Not at All
Heavy teaching load	63	26	6	2
Receive information too late to prepare competitive proposal	19	21	28	23
Heavy student advising load	24	23	24	22
Committee assignments	22	21	42	12
Other scholarly or entrepreneurial interests	13	34	33	16
Departmental or College administrative assignments	22	20	38	17
Campus review/approval requirements	8	8	32	44
Sponsor rules and regulations	6	11	39	28
Lack of training in grant seeking and grant writing	19	12	31	36
Lack of knowledge of funding sources	13	19	32	32
Lack of knowledge of budgeting	14	14	25	44
Too much work and bother	18	21	30	25
No colleagues with whom to work	12	16	30	35

Note: Percentages may not equal 100 percent because respondents who indicated "Don't Know" or "Does Not Apply" have been omitted.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4

Frequency of Provision of Selected Types of Technical Assistance

(Percentages)

	Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
How to look for grant opportunities	8	26	31	18	14
How to write competitive proposals	5	10	33	25	22
How to prepare an an accurate and adequate budget	5	9	30	23	26
How to get the necessary adminis-trative approvals	7	18	31	20	17
How to deal with prospective sponsors	4	7	21	30	27
How to deal with the College business office	5	12	19	26	29

Note: Percentages may not equal 100 percent because respondents who indicated "Don't Know" or "Does Not Apply" have been omitted.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 5

Importance of Provision of Selected Types of Technical Assistance

(Percentages)

	Very Important	Moderately Important	Marginally Important	Not Important
How to look for grant opportunities	50	34	9	3
How to write competitive proposals	55	27	8	4
How to prepare an an accurate and adequate budget	47	33	10	5
How to get the necessary administrative approvals	43	34	16	3
How to deal with prospective sponsors	45	32	13	5
How to deal with the College business office	40	32	13	9

Note: Percentages may not equal 100 percent because respondents who indicated "Don't Know" or "Does Not Apply" have been omitted.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SPONSORED RESEARCH IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

Faculty Questionnaire

1. How often do you usually engage in grant seeking or grant writing? (Mark one)

____ Very often
____ Often
____ Sometimes
____ Rarely
____ Never

2. How often do you receive assistance from your college in identifying or locating potential sources of outside funding for your ideas? (Mark one)

____ Very often
____ Often
____ Sometimes
____ Rarely
____ Never

3. How often does your college provide you or your teaching colleagues with the following for engaging in grant seeking and grant writing activities? (Mark one response for each option.)

	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Released time to prepare a proposal					
Released time to work on a successful grant					
Return to my department of a portion of the indirect costs derived from the grant					
Personnel support (e.g., secretarial help or graduate assistants)					
Administrative support (e.g., extra funds for travel or equipment)					
Consideration in tenure or promotion decisions					
Recognition in college publications					
Other forms of public recognition					
Other (please specify) _____					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4. How important are the following in encouraging you or your teaching colleagues to engage in grant seeking and grant writing activities? (Mark one response for each option.)

	Very Important	Moderately Important	Marginally Important	Not Important
Released time to prepare a proposal				
Released time to work on a successful grant				
Return to my department of a portion of the indirect costs derived from the grant				
Personnel support (e.g., secretarial help or graduate assistants)				
Administrative support (e.g., extra funds for travel or equipment)				
Consideration in tenure or promotion decisions				
Recognition in college publications or				
Other forms of public recognition				
Personal financial compensation				
Other (please specify) _____				

5. How important are the following in encouraging you to engage in grant seeking and grant writing activities. (Mark only one response for each option)

	Very Important	Moderately Important	Marginally Important	Not Important
Satisfaction of obtaining a grant				
Having the opportunity to support promising ideas or research				
Having the resources to acquire much-needed equipment with grant funds				
Gaining recognition for my institution				
Building my professional reputation as a capable researcher				
Other (specify_____)				

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

6. To what extent do the following usually prevent you from responding to grant opportunities in which you have an interest? (Mark all that apply)

	Very Much	Much	Somewhat	None	Does Not Apply
Heavy teaching load					
I receive information too late to submit a competitive proposal.					
Heavy student advising load					
Committee assignments					
Other scholarly or entrepreneurial interests					
Departmental or college administrative assignments (e.g., chairperson, Senate)					
Campus review and approval requirements					
Sponsor rules and regulations					
Lack of training in grant seeking or grant writing					
Lack of knowledge of funding sources					
Lack of knowledge of budgeting					
Too much work and bother					
No colleagues with who to work					
Other (specify:_____)					

7. How often do you usually find the time to write proposals that interest you.

____ Very often
____ Often
____ Not very often
____ Never
____ Does not apply

8. In priority order, which are the three most effective rewards that can be offered for those who engage in grant seeking and grant writing activities? (You may use any of the options identified in earlier questions or you may identify other rewards.)

First:_____

Second:_____

Third:_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

9. How often does your college provide you or your teaching colleagues with the following technical assistance in your grant seeking and grant writing activities? (Mark one response for each option.)

	Very Often	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
How to look for grant opportunities					
How to write competitive proposals					
How to prepare an an accurate and adequate budget					
How to get the necessary administrative approvals					
How to deal with prospective sponsors					
How to deal with the school district business office					
Other (please specify) _____					

10. How important is it for your college to provide you or your teaching colleagues with the following technical assistance in your grant seeking and grant writing activities? (Mark one response for each option.)

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Marginally Important	Not Important	Don't Know or Does Not Apply
How to look for grant opportunities					
How to write competitive proposals					
How to prepare an an accurate and adequate budget					
How to get the necessary administrative approvals					
How to deal with prospective sponsors					
How to deal with the school district business office					
Other (please specify) _____					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

For purposes of analysis, the following information would be most helpful.

11. Does your college have an operating grants or sponsored research office? (Mark one)

____ Yes
____ No
____ Don't know

12. What is your gender? (Mark one)

____ Female
____ Male

13. What is your professorial rank (Mark one)

____ Professor
____ Associate professor
____ Assistant professor
____ Instructor or lecturer

14. How many total years of full-time college-level teaching do you have? (Insert number)

____ Less than one year
____ 1-5 years
____ 6-10 years
____ 11-15 years
____ More than 15 years

15. How would you characterize your primary academic discipline? (Mark one)

____ Humanities
____ Natural science
____ Mathematics or information science
____ Social science
____ Health science
____ Education
____ Business
____ Fine and performing arts
____ Other

16. What is your tenure status? (Mark one)

____ Tenured
____ Non-tenured

17. If you had to identify the SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR in encouraging all faculty to engage in grant seeking and grant writing, what would it be?

_____

_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE